UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/647
S/1996/897
1 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-first session
Agenda item 58
QUESTION OF CYPRUS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-first year

Letter dated 30 October 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 29 October 1996, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Osman Ertuğ, representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 58, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hüseyin E. ÇELEM
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

ANNEX

Letter dated 29 October 1996 from Mr. Osman Ertuğ
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot delegate during the meeting of the Second Committee on 16 October 1996. This statement contains all too familiar allegations put forward by the Greek Cypriot side which are contrary to the realities of Cyprus. In view of the absence of any Turkish Cypriot delegate at the said meeting owing to the usurpation and continued monopolization of the title of "Government of Cyprus" by the Greek Cypriot side since 1963, I am compelled to respond to these allegations in writing in order to set the record straight.

In his statement, the Greek Cypriot delegate attempted to absolve the Greek Cypriot side of the exclusive responsibility for the existing division of the island by describing the legitimate military presence of a guarantor power as an "occupation". In fact, the only occupation in Cyprus is the 33-year-old usurpation and occupation of the seat of Government of the once bi-communal Republic of Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot side.

It will be recalled that the 11-year-long systematic ethnic cleansing campaign directed by the Greek Cypriots against the Turkish Cypriot people since the early 1960s had culminated in the Greek coup d'état of 15 July 1974, which had made the union of Cyprus with Greece (Enosis) imminent. The "Greek invasion of Cyprus", as it was described by the Greek Cypriot side's own leader, Archbishop Makarios, in his speech before the Security Council on 19 July 1974 (see S/PV.1780), was thwarted by the timely intervention of Turkey, which was in accordance with the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee. Turkey's legitimate intervention brought an end to the systematic human rights violations by the Greek Cypriots and saved the Turkish Cypriot people from total annihilation at the hands of the joint Greek and Greek Cypriot forces. It was, therefore, a rescue operation, which brought peace to Cyprus.

The Greek Cypriot delegate's remarks concerning the economic situation in Northern Cyprus, on the other hand, are the epitome of hypocrisy. If the Turkish Cypriot economy is experiencing difficulties, these are the direct result of the all-out inhuman embargo being applied by the Greek Cypriot side against the Turkish Cypriot people since December 1963. The Greek Cypriot side cannot wage economic warfare against the Turkish Cypriot people, on the one hand, and pretend to be concerned about the economic conditions in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, on the other.

A case in point is the Greek Cypriot blockade of the Ledra Palace crossing point in Lefkoşa (Nicosia) last weekend barring foreign tourists from crossing into Northern Cyprus. This action, as announced by the organizers, was aimed at tightening the restrictions on freedom of travel to the North with a view to preventing the revenues from tourists "feeding the economy of the North". According to the Greek Cypriot press of 22 October 1996, one of the organizers of the blockade, Mr. Marios Matsakis, who is a member of the Greek Cypriot House of Representatives, expressed his jubilation at the "success" of the blockade

and claimed that the North was now "10,000 Cyprus pounds poorer and will be even poorer with each passing weekend". Plans are under way to continue the blockade and even expand it to cover weekdays.

The leading role played by Greek Cypriot politicians in organizing this event, with the support of the Greek Orthodox Church and the notorious motorcycle club, as well as their manifest aim of the economic strangulation of the Turkish Cypriot people, are facts that speak for themselves. These unfriendly actions and declarations hamper prospects for the creation of trust and confidence between the two communities, as well as those for an overall political settlement.

I, therefore, call on the Greek Cypriot side to desist from such harmful activity, and abandon its overall policy of bringing about the economic ruination of the Turkish Cypriot people, in the interest of better relations between the two communities and a just and lasting settlement. In this spirit, I strongly protest the aforementioned remarks made by the Greek Cypriot delegate in the Second Committee as yet another manifestation of ill intent, insincerity and intransigence on the part of the Greek Cypriot side.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 58, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Osman ERTUĞ
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

UNITED NATIONS **A S**

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/648
S/1996/900
4 November 1996
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-first session
Agenda items 71 (g) and 72 (c)
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT:
REGIONAL DISARMAMENT
REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
CONCLUDING DOCUMENT OF THE
TWELFTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY: REGIONAL
CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-first year

Letter dated 31 October from the Permanent Representative of Ecuador to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a copy of the Santiago Agreement signed on 29 October 1996 in Santiago, Chile, by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador and Peru and the representatives of the Guarantor Countries of the Protocol of Rio do Janeiro (annex), by which it has been decided to begin, before the end of 1996, substantive talks on the border dispute between Ecuador and Peru and in which the procedures for the negotiations have been established.

The Agreement stipulates that the talks shall be conducted in accordance with the 1942 Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Boundaries of Rio de Janeiro, the Itamaraty Declaration of Peace of 17 February 1995 (A/51/188-S/1996/511 dated 2 July 1996), the Quito Agreement of 23 February 1996 (A/51/72-S/1996/148 dated 29 February 1996), the press release issued in Buenos Aires on 19 July 1996 (A/51/188-S/1996/511 dated 2 July 1996) and this Agreement; the purpose of the talks is to find a complete and lasting solution to the "remaining impasses" identified in the lists exchanged by the Parties in Brasilia on 6 March 1996 (A/51/77-S/1996/181 dated 11 March 1996).

I should be grateful if this letter and its annex were circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 71 (g) and 72 (c), and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Luis Valencia RODRIGUEZ
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Ecuador
to the United Nations

ANNEX

Santiago Agreement

As a result of the talks held in Santiago on 28 and 29 October 1996, the Foreign Ministers of Ecuador and Peru have agreed as follows:

1. In a spirit of mutual understanding and friendly respect, the Governments of Ecuador and Peru shall begin substantive talks in Brasilia before the end of 1996 for the purpose of reaching a complete and lasting solution to the "remaining impasses" identified in the lists exchanged by the Parties in Brazil on 6 March 1996. The talks shall be conducted in accordance with the 1942 Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Boundaries of Rio de Janeiro, the Itamaraty Declaration of Peace of 17 February 1995, the Quito Agreement of 23 February 1996, the press release issued in Buenos Aires on 19 June 1996 and this Agreement.

2. The talks, which shall be continuous and shall last until they have been completed, shall address all the remaining impasses individually and sequentially and no vetoes shall be permitted. The Parties agree that the talks shall focus first on those impasses which they mutually agree pose the least difficulty. The understandings reached on each item, which may entail reciprocal concessions, shall be deemed definitive only after a final comprehensive agreement has been reached covering all the impasses included in the lists provided by Ecuador and Peru.

3. When discussing each impasse, the Parties shall take note of those points on which they have been able to reach agreement as well as those on which they have been unable to do so. Using this methodology, they shall examine each impasse in sequence and take note of all points of agreement and disagreement.

4. The Guarantor Countries shall appoint a monitoring committee to assist with the matters referred to in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 above. The Guarantor Countries, in keeping with the responsibility incumbent upon them by virtue of their duty to assist the Parties, shall propose the most appropriate procedures for reaching a definitive solution to those points of disagreement which the Parties have been unable to resolve directly.

Done at the Palacio de La Moneda, Santiago, on 29 October 1996.

For the Republic of Ecuador:

Galo LEORO FRANCO

For the Republic of Peru:

Francisco TUDELA

Argentine Republic:

Alfredo CHIARADIA

Federative Republic of Brazil:

Ivan CANNABRAVA

Republic of Chile:

Fabio Vío UGARTE

United States of America:

Luigi EINUADI